



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,210	02/12/2002	Ib R. Odderson	ODDS 104	7049

7590 03/09/2004

Dean A. Craine
DEAN A. CRAINE, P.S.
Suite 140
400 112th Avenue NE
Bellevue, WA 98004-5542

EXAMINER

SANTOS, ROBERT G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3673

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/075,210

Applicant(s)

ODDERSON, IB R.

Examiner

Robert G. Santos

Art Unit

3673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1-3 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - 1) In claim 1, lines 6 & 9; claim 2, line 2; and in claim 3, lines 6 & 8: The term “means” should be deleted.
 - 2) In claim 3, line 8: The term “pumps” should be changed to --pump--.
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Castagna ‘223 in view of Armstrong ‘817. Castagna ‘223 does not specifically disclose the use of a timer connected to the pump and valve. Armstrong ‘817 provides the basic teaching of a body supporting device (10) including a plurality of transversely aligned, inflatable air bladders (16a, 16b); an air pump (22) and a valve (34, 36, 38) connected to the air bladders; and a timer (72) connected to the pump and the valve. The skilled artisan would have found it obvious at the time the invention was made to provide the body supporting, serial inflating seat of Castagna

Art Unit: 3673

'223 with a timer connected to the pump and valve in order to provide an alternate conventional means for ensuring sequential inflation and deflation of the seat as desired.

4. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonekawa et al. '533 in view of Hoshino et al. '982. Yonekawa et al. '533 disclose all of the limitations as recited in claims 1-7 (see Figures 1-4, 6, & 7; column 4, lines 1-44; and column 5, lines 8-37) except for the use of a timer connected to the pump and valve. Hoshino et al. '982 provide the basic teaching of a body supporting device (30) including a plurality of inflatable air bladders (34-39, 41, & 42); an air pump (51) and a valve (54) connected to the air bladders; and a timer (70b-70i) connected to the pump and the valve. The skilled artisan would have found it obvious at the time the invention was made to provide the body supporting, serial inflating seat of Yonekawa et al. '533 with a timer connected to the pump and valve in order to provide an additional means for ensuring sequential inflation and deflation of the seat as desired.

5. Claims 3, 4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Castagna '223 in view of Armstrong '817, and further in view of Jensen '506. Castagna '223, as modified by Armstrong '817, does not specifically disclose a condition wherein each inflatable air bladder is divided into a pair of bladders each extending transversely over one-half of a seat and under one leg of a user when sitting on the seat. Jensen '506 provides the basic teaching of a body supporting seat (10) comprising a plurality of transversely aligned, inflatable air bladders each divided into a pair of bladders (24) such that each bladder extends transversely over one-half of a seat and under one leg of a user when sitting on the seat. The skilled artisan would have

Art Unit: 3673

found it obvious at the time the invention was made to provide the body supporting, serial inflating seat of Castagna '223, as modified by Armstrong '817, with two sets of three transversely aligned, inflatable air bladders in order to permit greater adjustability according to the needs or preferences of a user, thereby providing enhanced user comfort.

Response to Amendment

In response to Applicant's arguments on page 7 of his amendment regarding the Smith et al. '939 reference, the examiner respectfully agrees. Hence, the prior art rejections under Smith et al. '939 have been respectfully withdrawn.

Conclusion


6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Daniels et al. '059, Kohlman '405, Clapper '080, Thomas et al. '450, Rowley et al. '263, Murphy '159, Hannagan '238, Murphy '184, Yamanaka et al. '082, Yamanaka et al. '618, Katoh et al. '409, Nagashima et al. '765, Kishi et al. '685, Kishi et al. '704, Kishi et al. '708, Zarotti '684, Cawley '118, Burgin et al. '786, Morrell '732, Poor '671, Wierwille '941, Forsyth '302, and Jensen '510.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert G. Santos whose telephone number is (703) 308-7469. The examiner can normally be reached on Tu-Fr and first Mondays, 10:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m..

Art Unit: 3673

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather C. Shackelford can be reached on (703) 308-2978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Robert G. Santos
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3673

R.S.
March 5, 2004